

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

RAAFAT ELSISY,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 2:19-cv-13346

District Judge Gershwin A. Drain

Magistrate Judge Anthony P. Patti

CITY OF KEEGO HARBOR, *et*  
*al.*,

Defendants.

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION  
REGARDING MOTION TO WITHDRAW COUNT II (LR 7.1), AND TO  
POSTPONE THE HEARING ON JULY 31, 2020 (ECF No. 41)**

On July 7, 2020, over three weeks ago, this Court sent electronic notification of a videoconference hearing to take place today on multiple motions filed by both Plaintiff and Defendants. (ECF No. 34.) In subsequent orders and notices, the Court has added additional motions to today's hearing docket, for a total of six motions. Yesterday, at the proverbial 11th hour, Plaintiff filed the above-referenced motion (ECF No. 41), seeking to clarify why he failed to follow local rule 7.1 in connection with his motion to withdraw Count II of his operative pleading (ECF No. 36) and seeking an adjournment of today's hearing because his car is not safe to drive to Detroit.

Plaintiff seeks to excuse his failure to comply with local rule 7.1 based upon the fact that he “was not aware that I had to obtain concurrence (LR 7.1) before filing my motion to withdraw Count II without prejudice.” (ECF No. 41, PageID.451.) Ignorance of the rules is never an excuse. Moreover, this Court previously informed Plaintiff in its scheduling order that:

You are required to follow the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Eastern District of Michigan Local Rules throughout the litigation process. The rules, and additional help for *pro se* litigants, can be accessed online via

<https://www.mied.uscourts.gov/index.cfm?pageFunction=proSe>.

(ECF No. 21, PageID.163.) Plaintiff is no stranger to the procedural rules, and invokes them with great regularity against his opponents.

Additionally, having prepared for today’s hearing at length, and there being no need for Plaintiff to drive to Detroit in light of the fact that the hearing has long been set to occur through Zoom, and there being no basis for an adjournment, today’s hearing will take place at 2:30 p.m., as scheduled. In his various filings, Plaintiff has repeatedly complained about delays in these proceedings. The Court sees no reason to delay them further. Plaintiff is expected to participate in today’s hearing, which will go forward with or without his presence. Plaintiff obviously has computer capabilities, in light of the fact that he is an e-filer. In the event that Plaintiff is unable to participate by Zoom, arrangements can be made for a telephonic hearing.

The motion (ECF No. 41) is accordingly **DENIED** in all respects.

It is **SO ORDERED**.

Dated: July 31, 2020

s/ *Anthony P. Patti*

Anthony P. Patti

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE